



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,531	09/07/2000	Tim Armandpour	P3929	2317
24739	7590	06/29/2005	EXAMINER	
CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY PO BOX 187 AROMAS, CA 95004			BASEHOAR, ADAM L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/656,531

Applicant(s)

ARMANDPOUR ET AL.

Examiner

Adam L Basehoar

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 10/07/04 to the original Application filed on 09/07/00.
2. The rejection of Claims 1-2, and 12-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freivald et al (US: 5,898,836 04/27/99) has been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.
3. The rejection of Claims 3-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freivald et al (US: 5,898,836 04/27/99) in view of W3C's, "HTML 4.0 Specification," 04/24/98, <http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-html40-19980424/>, pp. 1-27 (Hereafter W3C) has been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.
4. Claims 1-28 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, and 18 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
6. Claims 1-2, 12-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al (US-6,360,332 03/19/02).

Art Unit: 2178

-In regard to substantially similar independent claims 1 and 12, Weinberg teaches an application for enabling automated notification of applied structural changes to electronic information pages on a network comprising:

an interface for enabling users to build and modify network navigation and interaction templates using functional logic blocks (column 2, lines 25-35; columns 9-10, lines 48-23), for navigating to and interacting with interactive electronic information pages (columns 9-10, lines 48-22: "web site"; column 14, lines 39-41);

a navigation interface for integrating the software application to a proxy-navigation system for periodic execution of the templates (column 2, lines 35-39; column 6, lines 15-19);

a change notification module for indicating a point in process where a navigation and interaction routine has failed and for creating a data file containing parameters associated with the failed routine (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 19-22; column 17, lines 10-52)(Fig. 5F); and

storing the data file (column 2, lines 39-40; column 6, lines 19-22), wherein the application periodically submits test navigation and interaction routines (column 6, lines 19-22), and upon failure of the routine, creates a data file (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 19-22; column 17, lines 10-52)(Fig. 5F), the data file comprising a point-of-failure indication within the failed routine (Fig. 5F: column 17, lines 17-21), an identifier of the associated electronic page (columns 17-18: lines 62-12)(Fig. 5F: "URL: www.mercint.com"), and stores the data file in the data repository sending notification of the action to the developer (column 2, lines 39-40; column 6, lines 15-23).

Art Unit: 2178

Weinberg does not specifically teach where the data file was stored in a database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Weinberg to have stored the data file in a database, because Weinberg teaches storing the data file for later viewing (column 2, lines 39-40) and it was notoriously well known in the art that any storage of information could be looked upon as a database. In addition it was notoriously well known in the art that databases provided users the benefit of easy access to stored information.

-In regard to dependent claims 2, 13, and 19, Weinberg teaches wherein the network (column 5, line 5) could be the Internet (column 16, lines 9-10) and wherein the electronic information page was a web page (columns 9-10, lines 48-22: "web site"; column 14, lines 39-41) on the network.

-In regard to dependent claim 14, Weinberg teaches wherein the software application was an Internet (column 16, lines 9-10) based application executing and running on a server (Fig. 6C: Transactional Server).

-In regard to dependent claims 15 and 16, Weinberg teaches wherein a single server system hosting both the proxy navigation software and the software application (Fig. 6C: Transactional Server).

-In regard to dependent claim 17, Weinberg teaches wherein software application and the proxy navigation software are integrated as a single application enabling both

Art Unit: 2178

functions of navigation according to navigation templates and notifying and recoding failed instances of navigation (column 2, lines 26-40).

-In regard to independent claim 18, Weinberg teaches a method for receiving automated notification of random structural changes applied to electronic information pages hosted on a network comprising:

-establishing notification of a failed navigation and interaction routine executed for the purpose of navigating to and interacting with an electronic information page (column 6, lines 15-23; column 17, lines 10-52)(Fig. 5F).

-recording an instance of the failed routine including parameters associated with the cause of failure (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 19-22; column 17, lines 10-52)(Fig. 5F);

-accessing the recorded instance of the failed routine for review purposes (column 2, lines 39-40; column 6, lines 19-22);

-being able to navigate to the electronic information page identified in the recorded instance (i.e. via the stored URL of electronic information page in recorded instance)(columns 17-18, lines 62-12: "web page"; Fig. 5F: "URL: www.mercint.com");

-accessing source information associated with the electronic information page identified in the recorded instance (i.e. displaying the electronic page reference by the displayed URL (Fig. 5F) via the user browser (column 2, lines 25-30: "interactions between web browser and web server").

Weinberg does not teach wherein after accessing source information after test routine failure, creating new logic from info in the recorded instance and installing the

Art Unit: 2178

new logic into an existing navigation template for successful function. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Weinberg to have performed the above mentioned actions, because Weinberg taught in the background of invention, that it was well known in the art at the time of the invention for the test developer, after test failure, to have to revise the navigation template (test “script”) so that the test navigation could correct the defect and operate properly (column 1, lines 48-63).

-In regard to dependent claim 20, Weinberg teaches wherein the navigation routine was performed according to a test navigation template (column 2, lines 25-40).

-In regard to dependent claim 21, Weinberg teaches wherein the navigation routine was performed according to a client navigation template (column 2, lines 25-35).

-In regard to dependent claim 22, Weinberg teaches wherein the recorded instance of the failed routine was created in the form of a data file (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 19-22; column 17, lines 10-52)(Fig. 5F) and stored in a data repository (column 2, lines 39-40; column 6, lines 19-22) via the network (column 5, line 5).

-In regard to dependent claim 23, Weinberg teaches wherein the recorded instance of the failed navigation routine was accessed by a software developer (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 15-22)(Fig. 5F).

-In regard to dependent claim 24, Weinberg teaches wherein navigation was performed by the developer utilizing an instance of a browser installed on a computerized workstation (column 2, lines 25-30: “interactions between web browser and web server”; column 5, lines 4-12: “requests from users on a computer network”).

-In regard to dependent claim 25, Weinberg teaches wherein the new logic was in the form of a modular logic block installable to a navigation template (column 5, lines 15-16: “set or related business processes”; column 17, lines 10-34)(Fig. 5F).

-In regard to dependent claim 26, Weinberg teaches wherein the new logic block self-installs to a depended navigation template (column 1, lines 62-63).

-In regard to dependent claim 27, Weinberg teaches testing the new logic before the implementation (column 1, lines 63-65).

-In regard to dependent claim 28, Weinberg teaches creating more than one logic block within a navigation template and wherein more than one block could fail (column 16, lines 26-40). As discussed above, Weinberg teaches wherein it would have been beneficial to correct all the defects of the navigation template (test “script”) so that the navigation template would operate properly (column 1, lines 48-64).

Art Unit: 2178

7. Claims 3-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al (US-6,360,332 03/19/02) in view of W3C's, "HTML 4.0 Specification," 04/24/98, <http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-html40-19980424/>, pp. 1-27 (Hereafter W3C).

-In regard to dependent claim 3, Weinberg teaches wherein the logic blocks include site logic blocks/portions (column 5, lines 7-21; columns 9-10, lines 48-23: e.g. Text Check, Image Check, Applet Check). Weinberg does not specifically teach wherein the logic blocks were automated site-login blocks and automated site-registration blocks. W3C teaches that automated site-login blocks and registration blocks were well known in the HTML art at the time of the invention to be text input field elements (pp. 6-9) bound by HTML tags. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention, for the logic blocks of Weinberg to have included login and site registration blocks, because Weinberg taught submitting logic blocks for checking different parameter (i.e. text or number input) input as part of a business process (column 5, lines 7-23; column 15, lines 20-30) to verify that the those blocks were valid. As discussed above, W3C taught said logic blocks where notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention to be common HTML web page input blocks.

-In regard to dependent claim 4, Weinberg teaches wherein the software application was an Internet (column 16, lines 9-10) based application executing and running on a server (Fig. 6C: Transactional Server).

Art Unit: 2178

-In regard to dependent claim 5, Weinberg teaches wherein the application was accessible through a network browser (column 2, lines 25-29).

-In regard to dependent claim 6, Weinberg teaches wherein the templates are test routines (column 2, lines 32-40) executed for determining success or failure of the routine (column 3, lines 28-43).

-In regard to dependent claim 7, Weinberg teaches wherein the templates are executable instruction orders containing logic blocks (column 2, lines 48-51; columns 9-10, lines 48-22; column 13, lines 6-8).

-In regard to dependent claim 8, Weinberg teaches wherein the functional logic blocks are modular and self-installable within the templates (column 5, lines 15-16: "set or related business processes"; column 17, lines 10-34)(Fig. 5F).

-In regard to dependent claim 9, Weinberg teaches wherein the data files are human readable (Fig. 5F) and are accessed by developers (column 2, lines 36-40; column 3, lines 29-44; column 6, lines 19-24) for the purpose of affecting updating of the navigation templates (column 1, lines 62-63).

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Weinberg teaches wherein the developers access the application via individual computerized workstations (column 2, lines 25-30:

Art Unit: 2178

“interactions between web browser and web server”; column 5, lines 4-12: “requests from users on a computer network”).

-In regard to dependent claim 11, Weinberg teaches wherein the error notification and data file are performed in the event failure or a client’s personalized navigation template (column 2, lines 39-40; column 3, lines 29-43; column 6, lines 15-22)(Fig. 5F).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 12, and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

Art Unit: 2178

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US-5,958,008	09-1999	Pogrebisky et al.
US-6,470,383	10-2002	Leshem et al.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER